

Response to Rejections of Record

Claims 23 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Cho in view of Huffman and Jackson. The rejection is respectfully traversed. First of all, Cho does not have a continuously tapering opening, but an opening that is tapered at the bottom to accept the end of a pin. Furthermore, the opening the examiner refers to does not accept molding material, but accepts an extension from a tray which holds the molding material and the opening the tray is not continuously tapering, but is straight, then narrows at the bottom. The opening is in the articulator that accepts the tray with the projection for sitting in the opening.

Huffman is cited in relation to the cited projections on his tray. It is not disputed that Huffman has projections on his tray. However, the tray of Huffman does not have an opening for accepting molding material, but teaches an opening for a dowel to fit into. In fact, there is no continuous opening in either Cho or Huffman for acceptance of molding material, but a continuous opening in the articulator of Cho for acceptance of an extension from a tray. The openings in Huffman are neither continuous nor appropriate for acceptance of molding material. The openings are holes with tapered sides for accepting pins from a tray. The openings are in the articulator, and not in the tray.

Jackson is cited as teaching a continuously tapering opening. However, Jackson does not show a continuously tapering opening. Attention is invited to figure 2, which is an inverted view of the tray. The part identified as 7 rests in the ledge of 22. Hence, there is no continuously tapering opening from the surface of the U-shaped base of figure 4, but an opening which has, at the superior surface, a ledge for holding a tray with molding material on the tray. The opening, as in Cho, accepts a tray having molding material on it.

Claim 24 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Cho in view of Huffman and Jackson and further in view of Kuperman. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Because the invention can not be deemed unpatentable over the first three references for reasons given above, the addition of Kuperman does not suffice to render the claims unpatentable.

It is believed the claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Should discussion be likely to further prosecution of the application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 703 425 8405.

Respectfully submitted,



Glenna Hendricks, Reg. No. 32,535